THE ENCYCLOPAEDIA OF ISLAM

NEW EDITION

PREPARED BY A NUMBER OF
LEADING ORIENTALISTS

EDITED BY

C.E. BOSWORTH, E. VAN DONZEL
W.P. HEINRICHS AND *the late* CH. PELLAT

ASSISTED BY F.TH. DIJKEMA (pp. 1-384), P.J. BEARMAN (pp. 385-1058) AND MME S. NURIT

UNDER THE PATRONAGE OF
THE INTERNATIONAL UNION OF ACADEMIES

VOLUME VII

MIF — NAZ

LEIDEN — NEW YORK
E.J. BRILL
1993

This material is presented solely for non-commercial educational/research purposes.

independent of Persia, Byzantium and Medina, especially in view of the decline of Persia and the likelihood that trade between the Yemen and ʿIrāḳ would decrease.

While the movement led by Musaylima thus dealt with political and economic realities, it had a genuine religious basis, which is not entirely concealed by hostile Muslim propaganda. Many of the Banū Ḥanīfa were Christians, and Musaylima had clearly been influenced by Christian ideas. He spoke of the kingdom of heaven, and taught belief in resurrection and the Judgement of the Last Day when people were judged according to their deeds. For his followers he prescribed formal prayers three times a day, fasting, and abstinence from wine; the contrary statement about wine (Ibn Hishām, 946) is to be rejected as Muslim propaganda. He also made use of *sadj*ʿ, rhythmic assonanced prose, as in the early sūras of the Ḳurʾān, and some examples of this have ostensibly been preserved.

About the end of the year 10 (beginning of 632) Musaylima is said to have written a letter to Muḥammad suggesting some division of spheres of authority, but the suggestion was rebuffed by Muḥammad. His following among Banū Ḥanīfa increased greatly after Muḥammad's death, and he was felt to be a serious threat to the nascent Islamic state. Abū Bakr therefore sent a large army against him under Khālid b. al-Walīd. A fierce battle took place at al-ʿAḳrabāʾ [*q.v.*] with its centre in a walled garden or orchard (*ḥadīḳa*), which came to be known as "the garden of death" because of the numbers on both sides killed there. The Muslims were victorious, but lost many *ḳurrāʾ* or Ḳurʾān-reciters. Responsibility for the death of Musaylima was claimed by various men, including Waḥshī, the Abyssinian slave who had killed Ḥamza. Shortly before this battle Musaylima is said to have married Sadjāḥ [*q.v.*], the prophetess of the tribe of Tamīm. W.G. Palgrave, travelling in Nadjd in 1862, found Musaylima regarded as a prophet, and people quoted what Palgrave calls "burlesque imitations" of the Ḳurʾān, though he does not reproduce any.

Bibliography: Ibn Hishām, 312-13, 566, 945-6, 964-5; Wāḳidī, ed. Jones, 82, 269, 286-7, 863; Balādhurī, 86; Ṭabarī, i, 1560, 1737-9, 1748-50, 1795-8, 1871, 1880, 1915-21, 1929-57; Ibn Ḳutayba, *Maʿārif*, 206; Ibn Saʿd, i/1, 88, 108, i/2, 18, 55; J. Wellhausen, *Skizzen und Vorarbeiten*, iv, 102, 115, 167-7; vi, 15-19; Caetani, *Annali dell' Islam*, ii, 450-1, 635-48, 727-38; W.M. Watt, *Muhammad at Medina*, Oxford 1956, 132-7; D.S. Margoliouth, in *JRAS* (1903), 485 ff.; C.J. Lyall, in *ibid.*, 771-8; W.G. Palgrave, *Narrative of a year's journey through Central and Eastern Arabia*, London 1865, i, 382. (W. MONTGOMERY WATT)

MÜSELLEM (A.), an Ottoman military term alluding to provincial landed cavalrymen who later became transformed into auxiliary forces no longer employed in actual fighting but in discharging duties such as dragging guns, levelling roads, digging trenches, carrying provisions and casting cannon balls. Then, as the Ottoman state required them to pay taxes rather than serve in the army, they lost their privileged status and dissolved into the tax-paying populace.

The *müsellems* were established in the 8th/14th century during the time of Orkhan Ghāzī [*q.v.*]. They were each initially granted, in return for their service, a small parcel of land [see ČIFTLIK], on which they were excused from any dues or taxes, hence the name *müsellem* "exempt." What differentiated them from other Ottoman cavalrymen, the *sipahīs* [*q.v.*], was that the *müsellems* worked their own land and did not receive funds from the collection of taxes as the *sipahīs* did. This special condition necessitated that they support one another when called up for military service; the *müsellems* were therefore organised into groups of thirty men each called a "hearth" [see ODJAḲ]. They took turns in serving in the army; when five served, the other twenty-five in the hearth became "auxiliaries" [see YAMAḲ], providing a sum of money for the expenses and sustenance of the five during the campaign. The amount they gave ranged from 50 to 60 *akčes* for the rich auxiliaries to 10 to 20 *akčes* for the poor ones. The *müsellems* were under the command of troop leaders called *čeribashīs* who were under the authority of the provincial governors. There were *müsellem* holdings in both Rumelia and Anatolia, and these were recorded in registers called *müsellem defteri*.

After the Janissary corps expanded in the 9th/15th century and started their own units, the *müsellems* were relegated from fighting to accompanying the armies on campaigns as auxiliary labour teams. They discharged such duties as trench-digging and the hauling of cannon, often moving ahead of the main body of the Ottoman army with their spades and axes. Groups such as the gypsies of Rumelia were also organised into *müsellem* hearths during this century, their status being reduced to paying taxes as they ceased to perform military duties. Towards the end of the 10th/16th century, some *müsellems* were employed in Ottoman naval service but proved to be unsatisfactory, since their interests lay not in the sea but in their parcels of land. Because of this inadequacy, rather than serving in person, each *müsellem* hearth was then asked to make a yearly contribution to the navy; this relegated them from being in the service of the state to giving taxes to the state as ordinary peasants. A factor which contributed to this transformation was the *müsellems*' practice of farming lands adjacent to their parcels which they then gave taxes on, or of leasing out their parcels to others to be farmed. Even though the *müsellems* thus disintegrated as a provincial organisation in the early 11th/17th century, their name kept being used at a much later date for certain infantry charged with the upkeep of roads and military works, mostly in the garrisons of frontier fortresses.

Bibliography: Seyyid Muṣṭafā Nūrī, *Netāʾidj ül-wuḳūʿāt*, Istanbul 1909, iii, 92; M. D'Ohsson *Tableau général de l'Empire ottoman*, Paris 1791, vii, 308-9, 378-9; I.H. Uzunçarşılı *Osmanlı tarihi*, Ankara 1975, ii, 566, 570-1; idem, *Osmanlı devletinin merkez ve bahriye teşkilâtı*, Ankara 1984, 97, 103-4, 106, 382; Gibb-Bowen, i/1, 46-56, 99, 149, 188-192, 248-52, i/2, 16-7; Ahmed Refik, *Anadolu'da Türk aşiretleri (966-1200 h.)*, Istanbul 1930, 14; M. Zeki Pakalın *Osmanlı tarih deyimleri ve terimleri sözlüğü* Istanbul 1953, 627-8; A. de Jucherau de Saint-Denys, *Histoire de l'Empire ottoman depuis 1792 jusqu'en 1844*, Paris 1844, i, 90-2.

(F. MÜGE GÖÇEK)

MŪSH, modern Turkish Muş, a town and a province of eastern Anatolia lying to the west of Lake Van and Akhlāṭ [*q.v.*] or Khilāṭ (modern Ahlat). The town lies in lat. 38° 44′N. and long. 41° 30′E. at an altitude of 1290 m/4,200 feet in the foothills of the valley which carries the Murad Su river—a fertile plain on which wheat, tobacco and vines have long been grown—and which in recent years has borne the railway branch from Elâzığ [see MAʿMŪRAT AL-ʿAZĪZ] eastwards to Tatvan on the shores of Lake Van.

In the pre-Islamic period, it was the principal town of the Armenian district of Taraun (Hübschmann,

Idg. Forsch., xvi, 326; J. Saint-Martin, *Mémoires historiques et géographiques sur l'Arménie*, i, Paris 1818, 102). In Islamic times the name Ṭarūn (as spelled by Yāḳūt, iv, 534) is sometimes used for the town itself, as in al-Ṭabarī, iii, 1408 (cf. J. Markwart, *Süd-Armenien und die Tigrisquellen*, Vienna 1930, 354). The tradition of the Armenian historians connects the foundation of Mūsh with Mushel Mamikonean, the ancestor of the powerful, originally non-Armenian family of the Mamikoneans, who lived in the 4th century A.D. To him is ascribed the construction of a castle, the ruins of which are still visible on one of the hills that dominate Mūsh. This town itself is situated at the mouth of a mountain gorge, and before it extends, as far as the river, a large fertile plain, the "plain of Mūsh". During the first centuries after the Islamic conquest [see ARMĪNIYA, II, 2], Mūsh remained a centre of Armenian national life; from 825-51 it was the residence of the Bagratid Bagrat. After the abduction of this prince to Baghdād in 851, the inhabitants revolted and killed the Muslim governor Yūsuf b. Abī Saʿīd al-Marwanī (al-Ṭabarī, iii, 1408-9). Later on, it was part of the vassal kingdom of the Bagratids. Occasionally, it was occupied by Muslim adventurers, as in the days of Sayf al-Dawla (Ibn al-Athīr, viii, 408) in 353/964. About this time, the name Mūsh appears for the first time in Islamic geographical literature (al-Muḳaddasī, 150). In Saldjūḳ times, the influence of Islam became stronger; the atabegs of the Armanshāh dynasty disputed the territory of Khilāṭ and Mūsh with the Artuḳids and even the Ayyūbid Nadjm al-Dīn laid siege to Mūsh in 604/1207 (Ibn al-Athīr, xii, 169, 180), and in 625/1228 Djalāl al-Dīn Khʷārazmshāh was master of the country; in that year, a battle was fought by him and lost on the plain of Mūsh against the Saldjūḳ ruler of Erzurūm (Ibn al-Athīr, xii, 314; Djuwaynī, *Taʾrīḵh-i Djihān-gushā*, ii, 181). This accounts for the ruined state of the town in the middle of the 8th/14th century (Ḥamd Allāh Mustawfī). After the Mongol period, Mūsh was raided by Tīmūr in 788/1386, when he invaded the possessions of the Ḳara Ḳoyunlu (Sharaf al-Dīn, ii, 419). In 878/1473 the power of the Aḳ Ḳoyunlu ruler Uzun Ḥasan was definitely broken in Armenia, and from that time on Mūsh belonged to the Ottoman Empire. At that time, the population of its surroundings was already strongly mixed with Kurds and Turcomans. The direct authority was exercised by Kurdish local chieftains, who, in the ruling system of the Empire, were subordinated, as *sandjaḳ begs*, either to the *pasha* of Bitlīs or to that of Van. At the beginning of the 19th century, there ruled the Kurdish *mīrmīrān* Emīn Pasha, who was deposed in 1828-9 (Ritter, x, 676, and Mehmed Thüreyyā, *Sidjill-i ʿothmānī*, i, 426).

In the administrative changes introduced in the Ottoman empire after the Treaty of Berlin (1878), Mūsh town became the centre of a *sandjaḳ* of that name in the new *wilāyet* of Bitlīs carved out of the formerly very extensive *wilāyet* of Erzurum. At this time, Mūsh, with some 5,000 inhabitants, was half-Armenian Christian and half-Kurdish Muslim. There were bishops of the Armenian Gregorian and Catholic Churches and a Protestant community with schools directed by the American Mission. According to its inscription, one of the Armenian churches had been converted into a mosque in 979/1571 (Ritter). The surrounding countryside also had a mixed Muslim-Christian population, in which ancient Christian sanctuaries had long continued to exist, such as the monastery of Surb Karapet, called by the Turks Čañlī Kilise and described by Ewliyā Čelebi.

Towards the end of the century, revolutionary activity in the Mūsh region was begun by the Armenian nationalist Dashnak guerillas, starting *ca.* 1894. In the subsequent years, till 1904, bands under the Armenian leader Andranik were active, bringing savage reprisals from the Turkish authorities, culminating in the 1915 massacres in the Mūsh, Bitlīs and Sasun districts by Turkish troops and Kurdish irregulars. In the summer of 1916, the Imperial Russian Army overran northeastern Anatolia, including Mūsh, but this last was recaptured in 1917 by Muṣṭafā Kemāl's [see ATATÜRK] Turkish Second Army, and Russian troops withdrew from the whole area in accordance with the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk (March 1918). With the establishment of the ephemeral Armenian Republic in Transcaucasia 1918-20, Mūsh and Bitlīs came theoretically within the boundaries as laid down, when the infant state was in fact already succumbing to Turkish and Bolshevik pressure, by the Treaty of Sèvres (1920).

Under the Turkish republic, Muş has become a largely Kurdish town, the chef-lieu of the *il* or province of Muş, with a population of 44,000 in the town and 234,000 in the province (1970 census).

Bibliography: Yāḳūt, *Muʿdjam*, iv, 682; Abu 'l-Fidāʾ, ed. Reinaud, 392-3; Ḥamd Allāh Mustawfī, 106; Ḥādjdjī Khalīfa, *Djihān-numā*, ed. Constantinople, 416; Ewliyā Čelebī, *Seyāḥat-nāme*, iii, 228; C. Ritter, *Erdkunde*, x, Berlin 1843, 662 ff., 676 ff.; V. Cuinet, *La Turquie d'Asie*, i, Paris 1891, 551, 575; Murray's *Handbook of Asia Minor, Transcaucasia, Persia, etc.*, London 1895, 242; Sir Mark Sykes, *The Caliphs' last heritage*, London 1915, 406-9; Naval Intelligence Division, Geographical Handbooks, *Turkey*, London 1942-3, ii, 574 and index; C.J. Walker, *Armenia, the survival of a nation*, London 1980, 142-3, 178, 211-12, 243 ff., 315-17; *İA*, art. *Muş* (Besim Darkot).

(J.H. KRAMERS-[C.E. BOSWORTH])

MUSHĀʿ (A.) is a technical term denoting common and repartitional ownership by the entire village community of all agricultural lands of the village.

1. In the Near East. In villages in the Middle East where *mushāʿ* prevailed, the peasant community would convene once every year or two to divide the available land by lot to individual peasants. The history of the institution is extremely obscure. In the technical sense mentioned above, the word *mushāʿ* does not appear in classical Arabic dictionaries, which may suggest that the institution did not exist in classical Islam, despite the fact that it looks ancient. It is often associated with Bedouin concepts of landownership, but this association is far from certain. Thus Bedouin customary law of the Beer Sheba region in Mandatory Palestine was specifically said to lack any trace of *mushāʿ* (see ʿĀrif al-ʿĀrif, *Kitāb al-Ḳaḍāʾ bayn al-badw*, Jerusalem 1933, 236). Nor is the *mushāʿ* so much as mentioned in the 10th/16th century Ottoman agrarian *ḳānūns* and land surveys, where pieces of land are registered individually (all references to *mushāʿ* in Barkan's collection of 16th-century *ḳānūns* are to the literal sense of the word). Did the registration officials record the situation in a given moment, or was the *mushāʿ* as yet non-existent? This question must for the present go unanswered. Another important and difficult question is exactly where, geographically, did the *mushāʿ* institution exist? In the past it was usually held that practically the entire Middle East was governed by it. As research increases, the area of *mushāʿ* tends to diminish. Thus documents from the Judaean mountains in the early 20th century indicate that *mushāʿ* did